AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

# TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

•	liance with 35 § 290 and/or istrict Court Norther	15 U.S.C. § 1116	-	_	n has been  Or	
DOCKET NO.	DATE FILED		TRICT COURT			
CV 12-01484 DMR PLAINTIFF	3/23/2012		akland Division, 13 DEFENDANT	01 Clay Street, Suite 40	00S, Oakland, CA 94612	
ARIBA, INC.				TWARE INC.		
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK		HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK			
1				·		
2 *See attached complaint						
3 7,117,165				•		
4						
5						
In the above		Amendment	ve been included:  ☐ Answer	☐ Cross Bill	☐ Other Pleading	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK		HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK			
1						
2						
3				•		
4						
5						
	ve—entitled case, the follow	wing decision has	been rendered or j	udgement issued:		
DECISION/JUDGEMENT						
CLERK		(BY) DEPUTY	CLERK		DATE	
Richard W. Wieking		Valerie Kyono			March 30, 2012	

# COPY

Civil Case No.:

Robert T. Haslam (State Bar No. 71134) rhaslam@cov.com 2 Amy K. Van Zant (State Bar No. 197426) avanzant@cov.com 3 Matthew D. Kellogg (State Bar No. 280541) mkellogg@cov.com 4 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP 5 333 Twin Dolphin Drive Suite 700 6 Redwood Shores, CA 94065-1418 Tel.: (650) 632-4700 E-filing Fax: (650) 632-4800 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 ARIBA, INC. 10 11 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 15 Civil Case No.: ARIBA, INC., a Delaware corporation, CV12-01484 16 Plaintiff, 17 **COMPLAINT** 18 v. COUPA SOFTWARE INC., 19 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL a Delaware corporation, 20 Defendant. 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Plaintiff Ariba, Inc., for its complaint against Coupa Software Inc., alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Ariba, Inc. ("Ariba") is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 910 Hermosa Court, Sunnyvale, CA 94085.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Coupa Software Inc. ("Coupa" or "Defendant") is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 100 S. Ellsworth Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94401.

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. The Court has jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), in that this action arises under the patent laws of the United States (35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.).
- 4. Ariba is informed and believes that Coupa has its principal place of business in San Mateo, California, which is located in the Northern District of California. Ariba is further informed and believes that Coupa sells and/or offers for sale its services and products within the State of California, including the Northern District of California. Coupa maintains a registered agent for service of process in San Mateo, California.
- 5. The Defendant is therefore a resident of this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c), and venue exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

### INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

6. Pursuant to General Order 67, venue-based assignment of civil cases is suspended for newly filed patent cases, which are to be initially assigned pursuant to General Order No. 44 and Civil Local Rules 3-2 and 3-3. General Order 44 specifies that patent cases shall be randomly assigned to any judge of this Court and shall not be reassigned on the basis of intradistrict venue.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

7. Operating resources are the goods and services required to run a business. They can include capital goods, operational items, transportation, professional services, sub-components, and/or raw materials that a company needs to develop and manufacture a product or provide a service. In the past, companies had to procure operating resources through paper-

COMPLAINT	2	
Civil Case No.:	1 -	

based methods that were costly, inefficient, and prone to error. Because these traditional methods were fragmented and thus not broadly adopted by employees, they often failed to account for all operating-resource spending within an organization.

- 8. Ariba, formed in 1996, addressed these limitations through a series of fundamental inventions for implementing flexible, company-wide electronic procurement ("e-procurement") systems for each step of the procurement process, including locating and requesting operating resources, approving requisitions, and billing and payment. Ariba has obtained patents duly issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on its e-procurement inventions, including United States Patent No. 7,117,165 ("the '165 patent").
- 9. On information and belief, Coupa was founded in 2006 and offers Coupa e-Procurement software products that directly compete with Ariba's patented products. On information and belief, Coupa e-Procurement software products embody all of the elements of at least one of the inventions claimed in the '165 patent and therefore infringe this patent.
- 10. Coupa's infringement has deprived Ariba of sales of its e-procurement software products and has damaged Ariba's investment in its intellectual property. On information and belief, Coupa has obtained customers by using e-procurement solutions patented by Ariba and thus has exploited Ariba's investment in the research and development of its patented solutions. Coupa's continuing infringement deprives Ariba of its rightful customers and is continuing to damage Ariba and cause it irreparable harm.

### ARIBA'S FUNDAMENTAL E-PROCUREMENT PATENT

- 11. On October 3, 2006, the United States Patent and Trademark Office duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 7,117,165 ("the '165 patent") entitled "Operating Resource Management System" to Norman Adams, Marc Brown, Brian Carlstrom, Brian Elkin, Paul Hegarty, Guy Haskin, and Boris Putanec.
- 12. Ariba is the owner by valid assignment of all rights, title, and interest in the '165 patent. A true and correct copy of the '165 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Ariba has marked its products with the '165 patent.

# COUNT I DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,117,165

- 13. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint and restates them as if they were fully written herein.
- 14. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to directly infringe at least one claim of the '165 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a), by making, using, selling, and offering for sale the Coupa e-Procurement software products that embody the patented inventions, to the damage and injury of Ariba.
- 15. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendant's infringement of the '165 patent, Ariba has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and damages in an amount not yet determined, for which Ariba is entitled to relief.

### COUNT II CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,117,165

- 16. Plaintiff hereby incorporates the foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint and restates them as if they were fully written herein.
- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendant has and continues to indirectly infringe at least one claim of the '165 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(c), by making, using, selling, and offering for sale the Coupa e-Procurement software products that embody the patented inventions, to the damage and injury of Ariba.
- 18. On information and belief, Coupa sells and offers to sell its e-Procurement software products in the United States. On information and belief, the Coupa e-Procurement software products have no substantial non-infringing uses. On information and belief, use of the Coupa e-Procurement software products by Coupa's customers who engage in a purchase process constitutes direct infringement of one or more claims of the '165 patent. Coupa has knowledge of or should have had knowledge of the '165 patent by virtue of the marking of Ariba's competing e-procurement products.

COMPLAINT Civil Case No.: As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendant's indirect infringement of 19. the '165 patent, Ariba has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and damages in an amount not yet determined, for which Ariba is entitled to relief.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Ariba prays for relief as follows:

- A judgment that Defendant has directly infringed and/or contributed to the A. infringement of Ariba's '165 patent;
- A judgment permanently enjoining and restraining Defendant and its B. subsidiaries, parents, officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, affiliates, attorneys, and all others in active concert with them from directly infringing and/or contributing to the infringement of the '165 patent;
- A judgment awarding Ariba damages, including lost profits, adequate to C. compensate for Defendant's infringement, and in no event less than a reasonable royalty for Defendant's acts of infringement;
- A judgment awarding damages to Ariba for its costs, disbursements, and D. attorneys' fees incurred in prosecuting this action, with interest, and otherwise as provided by
- A judgment awarding Ariba pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on Ariba's E. damages as allowed by law; and
  - Such other relief as the Court may deem just and equitable. F.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Ariba demands a trial by jury.

24

COMPLAINT Civil Case No.:

# Respectfully submitted this 23rd day of March, 2012. COVINGTON & BURLING LLP BY any K. Van Zant /MDK Robert P. Haslam rhaslam@cov.com Amy K. Van Zant avanzant@cov.com Matthew D. Kellogg mkellogg@cov.com COVINGTON & BURLING LLP 333 Twin Dolphin Drive Suite 700 Redwood Shores, CA 94065-1418 Tel.: (650) 632-4700 Fax: (650) 632-4800 Attorneys for Plaintiff ARIBA, INC.

COMPLAINT 6
Civil Case No.: